UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,562	09/770,562 01/26/2001 William J. Curatolo		PC9674AJTJ	8513
²⁸⁵²³ PFIZER INC.	7590 03/26/200	EXAMINER		
	ARTMENT, MS8260-	FUBARA, BLESSING M		
EASTERN POINT ROAD GROTON, CT 06340			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/26/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

~IPGSGro@pfizer.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/770,562	CURATOLO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
BLESSING M. FUBARA	1618		

	BLESSING W. FUDARA	1 10 10	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE TH	IS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or application, applicant must timely file one of the followin application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 3 periods:	ng replies: (1) an amendment, affidav opeal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mai	ling date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expired.	s Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth e later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) of MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.0	07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office la may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704	extension and the corresponding amount e shortened statutory period for reply orig ter than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	malianaa wiith 27 CED 44 27 mwat ba	filed within two month	a af tha data af
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in confiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any ex Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed. 	tension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) They raise new issues that would require further 			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE be		i L below),	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection		,	,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be non-allowable claim(s). 	· ·	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is p The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,4,15,17,22,23,26,36,37,49-51 and	rovided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>28-35 and 38</u> .	 		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necess	o overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explana	tion of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered	but does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s			
13. Other:). (P10/Sb/06) Paper No(s)		
/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: a) amendment to claim 1 requiring the solid dispersion to consist of sparingly water soluble drug and HPMCAS requires further consideration and search; b) the proposed consisting language in claim 1 excludes solvent which would be present since the drug is a dispersion; c) further, the proposed amendment also raises the issue of new matter because the examiner cannot find a composition in the original specification that consists of HPMCAS and sparingly water soluble drug and the applicant has not directed the examiner to sections of the original specification that describes a solid dispersion that consists of HPMCAS and sparingly water soluble drug; d) the original specification does not implicitly teach a solid dispersion that consists of HPMCAS and sparingly water soluble drug; e) therefore, the rejections of record remain. Applicant's arguments that the rejections should be withdrawn because neither Miyajima nor Kigoshi discloses or suggests process for making solid amorphous dispersion containing low solubility drug and HPMCAS and solvent is not persuasive because the proposed amendment is not entered. It is also noted that the proposed amendment excludes solvent as seen in lines 3-5 of claim 1.

Applicant argues that the rejection of 02/06/09 should not have been made final because the claims were not amended and that MPEP 609.04 (b) III.2 clearly states that it is inappropriate to make it final under such circumstances. The examiner disagrees because MPEP 609.04 (b) III has to do with "INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FILED AFTER II. ABOVE BUT PRIOR TO PAYMENT OF ISSUE FEE (37 CFR 1.97 (d))," and does not have section III.2. Applicant filed the IDS after the office action of 5/2/08.

/BF/